

REMARKS

1. Claim 1 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

2. Claim 82 has been cancelled because it is identical to 79.

3. The July 21, 2004 amendment lists claim 5 as being in its original form. The reference to formula (2) in claim 5 as presented in the July 21, 2004 amendment was incorrect, the original language being "(3)". There was no intent to amend claim 5 to replace (3) with (2), and indeed the inset formula retained the "(3)". Thus, claim 5 was never amended to recite formula (2) instead of (3).

We consulted with Examiner Del Chism. On November 16, he advised us that, in filing this amendment, we should present claim 5 exactly as originally filed, and treat it as still being an original claim.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEWMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iver P. Cooper
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
IPC:lms
G:\ipc\n-q\Plou\Szardenings1\pto 312amendment.wpd